

projecting electrodes are formed of a conductive material. Claim 17 has been amended to be dependant on claim 13. Claim 18 has been amended to be dependant on claim 1 or 13.

A clean version of the amended and new claims is enclosed for the Examiner's review. Applicants have also enclosed a check for the requisite fees for the three extra independent claims.

REMARKS

Claims 1, 5-13, 17-26 are pending in the application. Applicants note that the Examiner has indicated that claims 5, 7, 17, 19, and 20 would be allowable if rewritten into independent format. The Examiner has also indicated that claim 9 would be allowable if rewritten to address the rejection under the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112 and rewritten in independent form. Keeping the aforementioned in mind, Applicants provide the following comments to the Office Action.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 8, 9, and 11 are rejected as being indefinite. Applicants request that these claim rejections be withdrawn.

Regarding the rejection of claims 8 and 9, Applicants have amended these claims to obviate the rejection. Claim 8 is now dependant upon claim 7 to provide sufficient antecedent basis as suggested by the Examiner. Claim 9 has been amended to be solely dependant upon claim 1. Applicants respectfully submit that "the multi-layer substrate" in claim 9 has sufficient antecedent basis due to the amendment to claim 1.

Regarding the rejection of claim 11, Applicants respectfully traverse. The phrase “terminal for adjustment” is clearly supported by the specification on pages 10 and 11.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-3, 6/1, 6/2, 10, 11, 12, 18/1, 18/2 are rejected as being anticipated by JP ‘741, JP ‘918, Knecht, Hatanaka, or JP ‘052.

Claims 4, 6/4, and 18/4 are rejected as anticipated by Knecht, Hatanaka, of JP ‘741.

Claims 13, 15, 16, and 18/13 are rejected as being anticipated by Hatanaka or JP ‘052.

Due to the claim amendments, Applicants submit that some of the aforementioned rejections are moot and that the other rejections should be withdrawn.

Independent claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of originally filed claims 2-4 and to further detail that the projecting electrodes are formed of a conductive material. Therefore, the relevant rejection is based on Knecht, Hatanaka, or JP ‘741 (which formed the basis of the rejection of claim 4). Applicants respectfully submit that the cited prior art fails to explicitly or inherently disclose each and every feature of amended claim 1. In particular, the cited references fail to teach projecting electrodes formed of a conductive material. As such, Applicants respectfully assert that amended independent claim 1 and dependant claims 5-12, 18/1 and 20/5 are allowable.

Independent claim 13 has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of independent claims 14-16 and to further detail that the projecting electrodes are formed of a conductive material. Applicants note that claims 13, 15 and 16 were rejected based upon Hatanaka or JP ‘052, but the Examiner failed to mention why claim 14 was rejected. Nevertheless, Applicants submit that independent claim 13 is allowable because the cited prior art references fail to

inherently or explicitly disclose that the projecting electrodes are formed of a conductive material. As a result, Applicants also submit that dependant claims 17, 18/13, 19, and 20/17 are allowable.

New Claims

Independent claims 21 (subject matter of original claim 1 and original claim 5) and 23 (subject matter of original claim 13 and original claim 17) are allowable because the claims indicate that the projecting electrode is a solder ball. Likewise, dependant claims 22 (subject matter of original claim 20 dependant on 21) and 24 (subject matter of original claim 20 dependant on 23) likewise are allowable.

Independent claims 25 (original claims 1, 6, and 7) and 26 (original claims 13 and 19) are allowable for reasons already made of record in the Office Action mailed April 9, 2002.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully request allowance of the application. If any additional fees are due in connection with the filing of this response, such as fees under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17, please charge the fees to Deposit Account No. 02-4300. Any overpayment can be credited to Deposit Account No. 02-4300.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 9, 2002

Signature:



Michael A. Makuch, Reg. No. 32,263
Smith, Gambrell & Russell, L.L.P.
1850 M Street, N.W., Suite 800
Washington, D.C. 20036
Telephone: (202) 659-2811

SGRDC/184186.1